



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,277	03/28/2001	Jerry A. Waldorf	SOFTECP.033A	1700
7590 03/18/2008				
Mark D Kirkland Fish & Richardson P.C. 500 Arguello Street Suite 500 Redwood City, CA 94053			EXAMINER MEINCKE DIAZ, SUSANNA M	
			ART UNIT 3692	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/18/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Attachment to Advisory Action

Applicant's main argument revolves around the assertion that Akifuji's action/definition table cannot be a second data store that requests performance of a particular activity of a particular instance of a business process. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Akifuji's action/definition table is used as a reference to determine which activity of a particular stage of an overall business process is the next to be performed; therefore, the action/definition table itself is effectively an indicator of which task should be performed next (especially when the information from the action/definition table is taken into account along with the workflow status). As seen in col. 5, line 27 through col. 6, line 20, the status watcher alerts the workflow engine to any changes in workflow status. Records are read from the action/definition table to determine which process is to be executed. As work is started and completed, its status is updated in a work-specific object. The stored status changes and updates themselves are indicative of activity performance requests and related messages. Also noted is that the recited "can be" language only requires that the second data store be capable of performing the respective functionality following the recited occurrences of "can be"; therefore, this functionality is not explicitly required to be actively carried out within the scope of the claimed invention. Furthermore, a "data store" can be interpreted as any collection of data (including a table, a file, a mere grouping of information, a database, etc.).

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive and the art rejection is maintained.

/Susanna M. Diaz/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3692